

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 12-16, 27-30 and 35-59 are now pending in this application. Claims 12, 27, 36, 44, 49 and 55 are independent. Claims 36 and 44 have been amended. Claim 59 has been added.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

**Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 36 and 44 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claims 36 and 44 can be found in the specification on at least page 4, lines 6-7. Claim 59 has been added. Support for claim 59 can be found in the specification on at least page 3, line 17.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C § 103**

Claims 12-16, 27-30 and 35-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behr et al. (U.S. Patent 5,543,789) in view of Funk (U.S. Patent 5,793,497). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is not addressing all of the distinctions of Applicant's various claims in the rejection of record.

Regarding claims 12 and 27, Applicant's claims require that the audio representation is sent to a voice mailbox, remote from the wireless portable unit. Behr et al. teach a system wherein text based driving directions are sent directly to a wireless portable unit (e.g. PDA, laptop). Funk takes a text message in a mailbox and converts it to a voice message and resaves the voice message in the mailbox. The missing link is that there is no teaching or suggestion in the prior art of record to send the travel directions in text format to the mailbox, remote from the wireless unit, in the first place, so that Funk's system can translate the text message into a voice message.

This missing step does not appear to be addressed in the office action. Rather, the Examiner only admits that Behr et al. show the output being a text based message. It should be noted that the text based message in Behr et al. is directly sent to the wireless portable unit, and not to the voice mailbox, "remote from the wireless unit." Funk does not cure this deficiency. Further, it is no cure to state that "users of the system [can] retrieve their messages in an audio format at a later time at the [sic] their convenience." This is not taught or suggested in the prior art of record. This advantage comes from the disclosure of the present invention. The prior art sends the travel directions directly to the wireless portable unit, and never contemplates the advantage of

sending the information to a voice mailbox for convenient retrieval at a later time.

Regarding claims 36 and 44, the Examiner's Office Action fails to address the distinction of a call taker receiving a voice call and manually entering data into a computer program / data processing device, in the combinations as claimed. The prior art of record (e.g. Behr et al. and Funk) fails to make any mention of a call taker who manually enters data, and therefore cannot show or suggest claims 36-48.

Regarding claims 49 and 55, the Examiner's Office action fails to address the distinction that the travel directions request is received in a voice form and converted into text information, in the combinations as claimed. Behr et al. receive a "data or text-type" information request from a comparatively sophisticated wireless portable device (e.g. a PDA or laptop). The present invention can be employed in conjunction with common, everyday cellular phone, because it is able to receive a voice-type inquiry for travel directions. Funk in no way cures this lapse in the disclosure of Behr et al., in that Funk merely teaches replacing text-base messages in a "mailbox" with converted voice-type messages.

A more detailed argument along the same lines as set forth above, which references text of the Behr et al. Patent, can be found in the Amendment filed June 13, 2002. These arguments are maintained by the Applicant, although not fully repeated herein. If the Examiner continues to reject the application,

the Examiner is asked to fully address the missing structures and steps of Applicant's claims relative to the applied prior art, and the motivation for supplying the missing structures and steps. If the Examiner believes that a personal interview would assist in the prosecution, the Examiner is asked to please contact the undersigned.

For the reasons as stated above, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Mr. Scott L. Lowe (Reg. No. 41,458) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


Applicant(s) respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and 1.17 for a one-month extension of time in which to respond to the

Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of \$110.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1602 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Scott L. Lowe, #41,458

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747  
(703) 205-8000

SLL:lmh